# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/800,312 | 03/12/2004 | Juan Carlos Martinez | 07781.0156-00 | 1750 |

22852    7590    12/10/2007
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| SHIU, HO T |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 4152 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 12/10/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/800,312 | MARTINEZ ET AL. |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | HO SHIU | 4152 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 March 2004</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 March 2004</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**SAM RIMELL**
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01 July 2005</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.  Claims 1-49 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Objections*

2.  With respect to claim 28 "(, via a translation code procedure?,)" is being recited. For examination purposes, "(, via a translation code procedure?,)" is not considered as it seems to be notes that was left but was not meant to be in the claim.

3.  With respect to claim 34 "(?)" is being recited. For examination purposes, "(?)" is not considered as it seems to be notes that was left but was not meant to be in the claim.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

4.  35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5.  Claims 23-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6.  With respect to claims 23-44, "computer program product" is being recited. A computer program product is not one of the categories of statutory subject matter. See MPEP § 2106.01

7.      With respect to claim 45, "a client-server computer system capable of

automatically configuring a translation code" is being recited.  The client-server

computer system comprises of components that are software related which is not one of

the categories of statutory subject matter.  See MPEP § 2106.01

8.      With respect to claims 46-49, they are dependent claims of claim 45.  Therefore,

they are rejected for the same reasons in claim 45 above as not one of the categories of

statutory subject matter.  See MPEP § 2106.01

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

9.      The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10.     Claims 14 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

11.     With respect to claim 14, the word "master" as related to the data between the

server and the client does not define the data between the server and the client.  For

examination purposes, master data between the server and the client is interpreted as

data between the server and the client.

12.     With respect to claim 36, the word "master" as related to the data between the

server and the client does not define the data between the server and the client.  For

examination purposes, master data between the server and the client is interpreted as

data between the server and the client.


### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.     The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.


**11.     Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-28, 30-40, 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as
being anticipated by Lee et al. (Pub # US 2002/0092004 A1, hereinafter Lee).**


12.     With respect to claim 1, Lee discloses a computer-implemented method for

automatically configuring a translation code, the method comprising the steps of:

translating data within a server into a data format required by a client using the

translation code ([0036], lines 1-4, [0035], lines 3-8);

transmitting the translated data from the server to the client ([0039], lines 5-9);

transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object

definition message ([0036], lines 1-3);  and

automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon receipt of

the data object definition message ([0039], lines 1-7).


13.    With respect to claim 2, Lee discloses wherein the data object definition message

is automatically transmitted from the client to the server upon change of the data format

within the client ([0036], lines 1-4, [0056], lines 15-19).


14.    With respect to claim 3, Lee discloses wherein the translation code is adapted to

the changed data format within a translation code generator upon receipt of the data

object definition message ([0036], lines 1-4).


15.    With respect to claim 4, Lee discloses wherein the translated data is transmitted

from the server to the client using a standard object description language ([0039], lines

1-7).


16.    With respect to claim 5, Lee discloses wherein the data object definition

message is transmitted from the client to the server using a standard object description

language ([0036], lines 15-19).


17.    With respect to claim 6, Lee discloses wherein the data format required by the

client is extracted and translated from the stored data by the translation code prior to

sending the translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [0036], lines

1-4).

18.     With respect to claim 8, Lee discloses wherein the server provides a data object

definition message format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0037], lines 10-14).

19.     With respect to claim 9, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing

access to the server by the data object definition messages via an authorization

management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

20.     With respect to claim 10, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing

data formats of different clients via a version management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5,

[0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

21.     With respect to claim 11, Lee discloses wherein, upon change of the data format,

the server requests the data object definition message from the client and the client

transmits the data object definition message upon request to the server ([0056], lines 1-

4, lines 10-19).

22.     With respect to claim 12, Lee discloses wherein the server automatically detects

changes in the data format of data associated with the server (0056}, lines 17-19).

23.     With respect to claim 13, Lee discloses The computer-implemented method of

claim 12, wherein the changes in the data format are detected by version identification

([0056], lines 17-19).


24.     With respect to claim 14, Lee discloses wherein the changes in the data format

are detected during an exchange of master data between the server and the client

([0057], lines 5-12).


25.     With respect to claim 15, Lee discloses wherein the translation code is adapted

to the changed data format within a translation code generator upon reception of the

data object definition message ([0063], lines 1-10).


26.     With respect to claim 16, Lee discloses wherein the translated data

is transmitted from the server to the client using a standard object description language

([0039], lines 1-7).


27.     With respect to claim 17, Lee discloses wherein the data object definition

message is transmitted from the client to the server using a standard object description

language ([0036], lines 15-19).

28.     With respect to claim 18, Lee discloses wherein the data required by the client is

extracted and translated from the stored data by the translation code prior to sending

the translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [0036], lines 1-4).


29.     With respect to claim 20, Lee discloses wherein the server provides a data

object definition message format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0037], lines 10-14).


30.     With respect to claim 21, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing

access to the server by the data object definition messages via an authorization

management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).


31.     With respect to claim 22, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing

data formats of different clients via a version management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5,

[0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).


32.     With respect to claim 23, Lee discloses a computer program product readable by

a computer and embodying a program of instructions capable of automatically

configuring a translation code, the program comprising instructions operable to cause

the computer to perform the steps of:

translating data into a data format required by a client using a translation code within the

server ([0036], lines 1-4, [0035], lines 3-8);

transmitting the translated data from the server to the client ([0039], lines 5-9);

transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server via a data object

definition message [0036], lines 1-3);  and

automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon the

server's reception of the data object definition message ([0039], lines 1-7).

33.    With respect to claim 24, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to automatically transmit the data object

definition message from the client to the server upon change of the data format within

the client ([0036], lines 1-4, [0056], lines 15-19).

34.    With respect to claim 25, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to adapt the translation code to the

changed data format within a translation code generator upon reception of the data

object definition message ([0036], lines 1-4).

35.    With respect to claim 26, Lee wherein the program further comprises instructions

operable to cause the computer to transmit the translated data from the server to the

client using a standard object description language ([0039], lines 1-7).

36.    With respect to claim 27, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the data object definition

message from the client to the server using a standard object description language

([0036], lines 15-19).

37.    With respect to claim 28, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to extract and translate, the data required

by the client from the stored data prior to sending the translated data from the server to

the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [00036], lines 1-4).

38.    With respect to claim 30, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to provide, via the server, a data object

definition message format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0037], lines 10-14).

39.    With respect to claim 31, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via an authorization

management process, access to the server by the data object definition messages

([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

40.    With respect to claim 32, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via a version management

procedure, data formats of different clients ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072],

lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

41.     With respect to claim 33, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer, upon change of the data format, to initiate

a server request for the data object definition message from the client and to transmit

the data object definition message upon request from the client to the server ([0056],

lines 1-4, lines 10-19).

42.     With respect to claim 34, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to automatically detect changes in the data

format by the server ([0056], lines 17-19).

43.     With respect to claim 35, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to detect the changes in the data format by

use of a version identification procedure ([0056], lines 17-19).

44.     With respect to claim 36, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to detect the changes in the data format

during an exchange of master data between the server and the client ([0057], lines 5-

12).

45.     With respect to claim 37, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to adapt the translation code to the

changed data format within a translation code generator upon reception of the data

object definition message ([0063], lines 1-10).


46.     With respect to claim 38, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the translated data from the

server to the client using a standard object description language ([0036], lines 15-19).


47.     With respect to claim 39, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the data object definition

message from the client to the server using a standard object description language

([0036], lines 15-19).


48.     With respect to claim 40, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to extract and translate the data required

by the client from the stored data, via a translation code procedure, prior to sending the

translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [0036], lines 1-4).


49.     With respect to claim 42, Lee discloses the program further comprising

instructions operable to cause the computer to provide, via the server, a data object

definition message format ([0039], lines 1-5, 0066], lines 6-7).

50.   With respect to claim 43, Lee discloses, wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via an authorization

management procedure, access to the server by the data object definition messages

([00039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).


51.   With respect to claim 44, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises

instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via a version management

procedure, data formats of different clients ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072],

lines 8-10, lines 15-17).


52.   With respect to claim 45, Lee discloses a client-server computer system capable

of automatically configuring a translation code, the system comprising:

a code generator ([0034], lines 1-2), associated with the server ([0034], lines 3-5), that

provides the translation code ([0036], lines 1-4) and that includes a subcomponent that

adapts the translation code automatically to a change of data format upon receipt of a

data object definition message ([0036], lines 1-4);  and

means, which uses the translation code provided by the code generator, for translating

data into a data format required by a client ([0036], lines 1-4, [0035], lines 3-8);

wherein translated data and the change of data format with the data object definition

message are transmitted from the server to the client ([0039], lines 5-9, [0036], lines 1-

3).

53.    With respect to claim 46, Lee discloses wherein the translating means extracts

the information required by the client from the data prior to sending the translated data

from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-9, [0036], lines 1-4).


54.    With respect to claim 47, Lee discloses further comprising a managing procedure

that manages the data format of the data object definition message ([0039], lines 1-5,

[0066], lines 6-7).


55.    With respect to claim 48, Lee discloses further comprising an access control

procedure that controls access to the server by the data object definition messages

([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).


56.    With respect to claim 409, Lee discloses further comprising a detection

procedure that automatically detects changes in the data format ([0036], lines 1-4,

[0056], lines 15-19).


## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

57.    The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**58.    Claims 7, 19, 29, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

**unpatentable over Lee as applied to claims 1, 2, 11, 23, 24, 33 in view of Salter et**

**al. (US Pub # 2004/0010753 A1, hereinafter Salter).**

59.    With respect to claim 7, Lee discloses the claimed invention except where the

translation code uses XSL for translating the data into said the data format required by

the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses where the translation code uses

XSL for translating the data into said the data format required by the client ([0014], lines

2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of

Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files

to an html page.

60.    With respect to claim 19, Lee discloses the claimed invention except where the

translation code uses XSL for translating the data into the data format used by the

client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses where the translation code uses

XSL for translating the data into the data format used by the client ([0014], lines 2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of

Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files

to an html page.


61.    With respect to claim 29, Lee discloses the claimed invention except to use XSL

in the translation code for translating the data into the data format used by the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses to use XSL in the translation code

for translating the data into the data format used by the client. ([0014], lines 2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of

Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files

to an html page.


62.    With respect to claim 41, Lee discloses the claimed invention except to use XSL

in the translation code for translating the data into the data format used by the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses to use XSL in the translation code

for translating the data into the data format used by the client. ([0014], lines 2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of

Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files

to an html page.

## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ho Ting Shiu whose telephone number is 571-270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (7:30am - 6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HTS
11/26/2007

NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER